

CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT:

Parts I and II

**for
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS
under the
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT
As amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**

**For reporting on
School Year 2007-08**

CALIFORNIA



**PART I DUE FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008
PART II DUE FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2009**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple ESEA programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies—State, local, and Federal—is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning. The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following ESEA programs:

- Title I, Part A – Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs
- Title I, Part C – Education of Migratory Children (Includes the Migrant Child Count)
- Title I, Part D – Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- Title II, Part A – Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)
- Title III, Part A – English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)
- Title V, Part A – Innovative Programs
- Title VI, Section 6111 – Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities
- Title VI, Part B – Rural Education Achievement Program
- Title X, Part C – Education for Homeless Children and Youths

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) for school year (SY) 2007-08 consists of two Parts, Part I and Part II.

PART I

Part I of the CSPR requests information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in Section 1111(h)(4) of the ESEA. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are:

- **Performance Goal 1: By SY 2013-14, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- **Performance Goal 2: All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.**
- **Performance Goal 3: By SY 2005-06, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.**
- **Performance Goal 4: All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.**
- **Performance Goal 5: All students will graduate from high school.**

Beginning with the CSPR SY 2005-06 collection, the Education of Homeless Children and Youths was added. The Migrant Child count was added for the SY 2006-07 collection.

PART II

Part II of the CSPR consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs. While the information requested varies from program to program, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria:

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations pending full implementation of required EDFacts submission.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the SY 2007-08 must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR). Part I of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, December 19, 2008. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by Friday, February 27, 2009. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the SY 2007-08, unless otherwise noted.

The format states will use to submit the Consolidated State Performance Report has changed to an online submission starting with SY 2004-05. This online submission system is being developed through the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN) and will make the submission process less burdensome. Please see the following section on transmittal instructions for more information on how to submit this year's Consolidated State Performance Report.

TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

The Consolidated State Performance Report (CSPR) data will be collected online from the SEAs, using the EDEN web site. The EDEN web site will be modified to include a separate area (sub-domain) for CSPR data entry. This area will utilize EDEN formatting to the extent possible and the data will be entered in the order of the current CSPR forms. The data entry screens will include or provide access to all instructions and notes on the current CSPR forms; additionally, an effort will be made to design the screens to balance efficient data collection and reduction of visual clutter.

Initially, a state user will log onto EDEN and be provided with an option that takes him or her to the "SY 2007-08 CSPR". The main CSPR screen will allow the user to select the section of the CSPR that he or she needs to either view or enter data. After selecting a section of the CSPR, the user will be presented with a screen or set of screens where the user can input the data for that section of the CSPR. A user can only select one section of the CSPR at a time. After a state has included all available data in the designated sections of a particular CSPR Part, a lead state user will certify that Part and transmit it to the Department. Once a Part has been transmitted, ED will have access to the data. States may still make changes or additions to the transmitted data, by creating an updated version of the CSPR. Detailed instructions for transmitting the SY 2007-08 CSPR will be found on the main CSPR page of the EDEN web site (<https://EDEN.ED.GOV/EDENPortal/>).

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 111 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) contact School Support and Technology Programs, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20202-6140. Questions about the new electronic CSPR submission process, should be directed to the EDEN Partner Support Center at 1-877-HLP-EDEN (1-877-457-3336).

OMB Number: 1810-0614 Expiration Date:
10/31/2010

Consolidated State Performance Report
For
State Formula Grant Programs
under the
Elementary And Secondary Education Act
as amended by the
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Check the one that indicates the report you are submitting: Part I, 2007-08 X Part II, 2007-08

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:
California Department of Education
Address:
1430 N Street
Sacramento, CA 95814 Person to contact about this report:

Name: Justin Lane
Telephone: 916-319-0495
Fax: 916-319-0971
e-mail: jlane@cde.ca.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):

Deb Sigman

Thursday, May 7, 2009, 7:08:49 PM

Signature Date

**CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT
PART II**

For reporting on
School Year 2007-08



**PART II DUE FEBRUARY 27, 2009
5PM EST**

2.1 IMPROVING BASIC PROGRAMS OPERATED BY LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE I, PART A)

This section collects data on Title I, Part A programs.

2.1.1 Student Achievement in Schools with Title I, Part A Programs

The following sections collect data on student academic achievement on the State's NCLB assessments in schools that receive Title I, Part A funds and operate either Schoolwide programs or Targeted Assistance programs.

2.1.1.1 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

In the format of the table below, provide the number of students in SWP schools who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, in grades 3 through 8 and high school, on the State's NCLB mathematics assessments under Section 1111(b)(3) of ESEA. Also, provide the number of those students who scored at or above proficient. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	223,691	122,001	54.5
4	224,078	122,191	54.5
5	227,453	100,714	44.3
6	202,089	71,128	35.2
7	187,541	64,951	34.6
8	189,905	55,382	29.2
High School	121,343	51,487	42.4
Total	1,376,100	587,854	42.7
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

2.1.1.2 Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Schoolwide Schools (SWP)

This section is similar to 2.1.1.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on performance on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment in SWP.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	223,586	63,631	28.5
4	224,201	99,833	44.5
5	227,305	86,719	38.2
6	201,732	74,727	37.0
7	187,603	72,556	38.7
8	189,851	68,512	36.1
High School	120,651	51,037	42.3
Total	1,374,929	517,015	37.6
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

2.1.1.3 Student Achievement in Mathematics in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS)

In the table below, provide the number of all students in TAS who completed the assessment and for whom a proficiency level was assigned, in grades 3 through 8 and high school, on the State's NCLB mathematics assessments under Section 1111(b) (3) of ESEA. Also, provide the number of those students who scored at or above proficient. The percentage of students who scored at or above proficient is calculated automatically.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	69,180	43,618	63.1
4	69,452	43,684	62.9
5	70,764	37,571	53.1
6	72,542	34,202	47.1
7	74,320	34,937	47.0
8	74,815	32,632	43.6
High School	66,814	34,677	51.9
Total	497,887	261,321	52.5
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

2.1.1.4 Student Achievement in Reading/Language Arts in Targeted Assistance Schools (TAS)

This section is similar to 2.1.1.3. The only difference is that this section collects data on performance on the State's NCLB reading/language arts assessment by all students in TAS.

Grade	# Students Who Completed the Assessment and for Whom a Proficiency Level Was Assigned	# Students Scoring At or Above Proficient	Percentage At or Above Proficient
3	69,106	28,724	41.6
4	69,537	41,003	59.0
5	70,710	36,827	52.1
6	72,422	37,728	52.1
7	74,431	40,725	54.7
8	74,863	38,616	51.6
High School	66,719	35,561	53.3
Total	497,788	259,184	52.1
Comments:			

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

2.1.2 Title I, Part A Student Participation

The following sections collect data on students participating in Title I, Part A by various student characteristics.

2.1.2.1 Student Participation in Public Title I, Part A by Special Services or Programs

In the table below, provide the number of public school students served by either Public Title I SWP or TAS programs at any time during the regular school year for each category listed. Count each student only once in each category even if the student participated during more than one term or in more than one school or district in the State. Count each student in as many of the categories that are applicable to the student. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. Do not include the following individuals:

(1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

	# Students Served
Children with disabilities (IDEA)	332,845
Limited English proficient students	1,200,144
Students who are homeless	123,945
Migratory students	106,476
Comments:	

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X037 that is data group 548, category sets B, C, D and E.

2.1.2.2 Student Participation in Public Title I, Part A by Racial/Ethnic Group

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of public school students served by either public Title I SWP or TAS at any time during the regular school year. Each student should be reported in only one racial/ethnic category. Include pre-kindergarten through grade 12. The total number of students served will be calculated automatically.

Do not include: (1) adult participants of adult literacy programs funded by Title I, (2) private school students participating in Title I programs operated by local educational agencies, or (3) students served in Part A local neglected programs.

Race/Ethnicity	# Students Served
American Indian or Alaska Native	25,284
Asian or Pacific Islander	240,736
Black, non-Hispanic	291,958
Hispanic	2,158,170
White, non-Hispanic	454,921
Total	3,171,069
Comments:	

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X037 that is data group 548, category set A.

2.1.2.3 Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students participating in Title I, Part A programs by grade level and by type of program: Title I public targeted assistance programs (Public TAS), Title I schoolwide programs (Public SWP), private school students participating in Title I programs (private), and Part A local neglected programs (local neglected). The totals column by type of program will be automatically calculated.

Age/Grade	Public TAS	Public SWP	Private	Local Neglected	Total
Age 0-2					
Age 3-5 (not Kindergarten)	302	6,044		91	6,437
K	24,059	254,667		402	279,128
1	28,377	263,554		697	292,628
2	30,010	258,244		679	288,933
3	31,440	251,439		725	283,604
4	32,078	249,789		679	282,546
5	29,693	248,669		824	279,186
6	31,385	227,388		914	259,687
7	33,034	210,607		1,274	244,915
8	34,746	216,309		1,701	252,756
9	45,314	180,358		2,315	227,987
10	38,964	155,698		2,117	196,779
11	36,079	136,191		1,983	174,253
12	30,968	122,675		1,517	155,160
Ungraded	2,047	34,939		173	37,159
TOTALS	428,496	2,816,571		16,091	3,261,158
Comments: California does not collect data age 0-2. In addition, California does not collect student participation in Title I, Part A programs for private schools by grade level.					

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X134, that is data group 670, category set A.

2.1.2.4 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional and Support Services

The following sections request data about the participation of students in TAS.

2.1.2.4.1 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional Services

In the table below, provide the number of students receiving each of the listed instructional services through a TAS program funded by Title I, Part A. Students may be reported as receiving more than one instructional service. However, students should be reported only once for each instructional service regardless of the frequency with which they received the service.

	# Students Served
Mathematics	290,470
Reading/language arts	358,593
Science	85,611
Social studies	87,836
Vocational/career	14,317
Other instructional services	24,261
Comments:	

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X036 that is data group 549, category set A.

2.1.2.4.2 Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Support Services

In the table below, provide the number of students receiving each of the listed support services through a TAS program funded by Title I, Part A. Students may be reported as receiving more than one support service. However, students should be reported only once for each support service regardless of the frequency with which they received the service.

	# Students Served
Health, dental, and eye care	51,492
Supporting guidance/advocacy	86,410
Other support services	3,443
Comments:	

Source – The table above is produced through EDFacts. The SEA submits the data in file N/X036, that is data group 549, category set B.

2.1.3 Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs (TAS)

In the table below, provide the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff funded by a Title I, Part A TAS in each of the staff categories. For staff who work with both TAS and SWP, report only the FTE attributable to their TAS responsibilities.

For paraprofessionals only, provide the percentage of paraprofessionals who were qualified in accordance with Section 1119 (c) and (d) of ESEA.

See the FAQs following the table for additional information.

Staff Category	Staff FTE	Percentage Qualified
Teachers	1,576.70	
Paraprofessionals ¹	1,532.00	97.9
Other paraprofessionals (translators, parental involvement, computer assistance) ²	153.00	
Clerical support staff	397.10	
Administrators (non-clerical)	144.40	
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on staff information

- a. *What is a "paraprofessional?" An employee of an LEA who provides instructional support in a program supported with Title I, Part A funds. Instructional support includes the following activities:*
 - (1) Providing one-on-one tutoring for eligible students, if the tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher;
 - (2) Providing assistance with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials;
 - (3) Providing assistance in a computer laboratory;
 - (4) Conducting parental involvement activities;
 - (5) Providing support in a library or media center;
 - (6) Acting as a translator; or
 - (7) Providing instructional services to students.
- b. *What is an "other paraprofessional?" Paraprofessionals who do not provide instructional support, for example, paraprofessionals who are translators or who work with parental involvement or computer assistance.*
- c. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional? A paraprofessional who has (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and been able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at: <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>.*

1 Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

2 Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(e).

2.1.3.1 Paraprofessional Information for Title I, Part A Schoolwide Programs

In the table below, provide the number of FTE paraprofessionals who served in SWP and the percentage of these paraprofessionals who were qualified in accordance with Section 1119 (c) and (d) of ESEA. Use the additional guidance found below the previous table.

	Paraprofessionals FTE	Percentage Qualified
Paraprofessionals3		
Comments: We do not currently collect FTE data for Schoolwide Programs.		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool. 3 Consistent with ESEA, Title I, Section 1119(g)(2).

2.2 WILLIAM F. GOODLING EVEN START FAMILY LITERACY PROGRAMS (TITLE I, PART B, SUBPART 3)

2.2.1 Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants

For the reporting program year July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008, please provide the following information:

2.2.1.1 Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State

Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants	78
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.1.2 Even Start Families Participating During the Year

In the table below, provide the number of participants for each of the groups listed below. The following terms apply:

1. "Participating" means enrolled and participating in all four core instructional components.
2. "Adults" includes teen parents.
3. For continuing children, calculate the age of the child on July 1, 2007. For newly enrolled children, calculate their age at the time of enrollment in Even Start.

4. Do not use rounding rules. The total number of participating children will be calculated automatically.

	# Participants
1. Families participating	2,943
2. Adults participating	2,964
3. Adults participating who are limited English proficient (Adult English Learners)	2,698
4. Participating children	3,716
a. Birth through 2 years	1,207
b. Age 3 through 5	1,563
c. Age 6 through 8	794
c. Above age 8	152
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.1.3 Characteristics of Newly Enrolled Families at the Time of Enrollment

In the table below, provide the number of newly enrolled families for each of the groups listed below. The term "newly enrolled family" means a family who enrolls for the first time in the Even Start project or who had previously been in Even Start and reenrolls during the year.

	#
1. Number of newly enrolled families	1,584
2. Number of newly enrolled adult participants	1,590
3. Number of newly enrolled families at or below the federal poverty level at the time of enrollment	1,265
4. Number of newly enrolled adult participants without a high school diploma or GED at the time of enrollment	1,357
5. Number of newly enrolled adult participants who have not gone beyond the 9th grade at the time of enrollment	777
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.1.4 Retention of Families

In the table below, provide the number of families who are newly enrolled, those who exited the program during the year, and those continuing in the program. For families who have exited, count the time between the family's start date and exit date. For families continuing to participate, count the time between the family's start date and the end of the reporting year (June 30, 2008). For families who had previously exited Even Start and then enrolled during the reporting year, begin counting from the time of the family's original enrollment date. Report each family only once in lines 1-4. Note enrolled families means a family who is participating in all four core instructional components. The total number of families participating will be automatically calculated.

Time in Program	#
1. Number of families enrolled 90 days or less	129
2. Number of families enrolled more than 90 but less than 180 days or less	406
3. Number of families enrolled more than 180 days but 365 days or less	1,126
4. Number of families enrolled more than 365 days	1,282
5. Total families enrolled	2,943
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2 Federal Even Start Performance Indicators

This section collects data about the federal Even Start Performance Indicators.

In the space below, provide any explanatory information necessary for understanding the data provided in this section on performance indicators.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

California Even Start projects collected performance indicator data from approximately 80% of all adult and child participants served during the 2007-08 program year. Data collection rates by participant group and indicator are as follows:

1. Pretest/posttest CASAS scores, GED and diploma attainment rates were collected for 77% or 2,287 of the 2,964 adult participants.
2. PPVT III pretest/posttest scores were collected for 87% of the 775 children transitioning to kindergarten in September 2008.
3. Progress report cards and California Start Test (CST) reading test scores were collected for 82% of the 946 children enrolled in grades K-3.
4. Parent Education Profile (PEP) pretest/posttest scores were collected for 80% of the 2,964 adults participating in parent education classes.

2.2.2.1 Adults Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

In the table below, provide the number of adults who showed significant learning gains on measures of reading. To be counted under "pre-and post-test", an individual must have completed both the pre-and post-tests.

The definition of "significant learning gains" for adult education is determined by your State's adult education program in conjunction with the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Vocational and Adult Education (OVAE).

These instructions/definitions apply to both 2.2.2.1 and 2.2.2.2. Note: Do

not include the Adult English Learners counted in 2.2.2.2.

	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
TABE	0	0	Projects are not required to administer TABE.
CASAS	32	24	75% of eligible adults enrolled in Adult Basic Education showed significant learning gains in reading. Significant gains are defined as a 5-point scaled score posttest gain for beginning level students and a 3-point posttest gain for intermediate level students. Eligible Cohort: Eligible adults, as defined by the California Performance Indicator, include adults who attended 100+ hours of Adult Basic Education who achieved the Indicator in less than 100 hours.
Other			
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.2 Adult English Learners Showing Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Reading

In the table below, provide the number of Adult English Learners who showed significant learning gains on measures of reading.

	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
BEST	0	0	Projects are not required to administer BEST.
CASAS	2,086	1,678	80.44% of eligible English Learner adults showed significant learning gains in reading. Significant gains are defined as a 5-point scaled score posttest gain for beginning level students and a 3-point posttest gain for intermediate level students. Eligible Cohort: Eligible adults, as defined by the California Performance Indicator, include adults who attended 100+ hours of English as a Second Language or who achieved the Indicator in less than 100 hours.
TABE	0	0	Projects are not required to administer TABE.
Other			
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.3 Adults Earning a High School Diploma or GED

In the table below, provide the number of school-age and non-school age adults who earned a high school diploma or GED during the reporting year.

The following terms apply:

1. "School-age adults" is defined as any parent attending an elementary or secondary school. This also includes those adults within the State's compulsory attendance range who are being served in an alternative school setting, such as directly through the Even Start program.
2. "Non-school-age" adults are any adults who do not meet the definition of "school-age."
3. Include only the number of adult participants who had a realistic goal of earning a high school diploma or GED. Note that age limitations on taking the GED differ by State, so you should include only those adult participants for whom attainment of a GED or high school diploma is a possibility.

School-Age Adults	# with goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	26	24	92.3% of eligible school-age adults received a high school diploma. Eligible Cohort: Eligible school-age adults, as defined by the California Performance Indicator, include teen parents who attended high school classes for a minimum of 3 years and those who received a diploma in less than 3 years. An additional 150 school-age adults made progress toward their goal of a diploma by earning high school course credits.
GED	0	0	School-age adults did not obtain GED certificates. All school-age adults enrolled in a high school diploma program.
Other			
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Non-School-Age Adults	# with goal	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
Diploma	17	17	100% of eligible non-school-age adults received a high school diploma. Eligible Cohort: Eligible non-school-age adults, as defined by the California Performance Indicator, include adults who attended high school classes for a minimum of 3 years and those who received a diploma in less than 3 years. An additional 30 adults made progress toward their goal of a diploma by earning high school course credits.
GED	19	18	94.74% of eligible non-school-age adults obtained an English GED certificate. Eligible Cohort: Eligible non-school-age adults, as defined by the California Performance Indicator, include adults who attended GED preparation classes for a minimum of 2 years and adults who obtained their GED in less than two years.
Other	37	29	Spanish GED: 78.38% of eligible non-school-age adults obtained a Spanish certificate. Eligible Cohort: Eligible non-school-age adults, as defined by the California Performance Indicator, include adults who attended GED preparation classes for a minimum of 2 years and adults who obtained their GED in less than two years.
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.4 Children Age-Eligible for Kindergarten Who Are Achieving Significant Learning Gains on Measures of Language Development

In the table below, provide the number of children who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development.

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year who have been in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took both a pre-and post-test with at least 6 months of Even Start service in between.
3. A "significant learning gain" is considered to be a standard score increase of 4 or more points.
4. "Exempted" includes the number of children who could not take the test (based on the practice items) due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.

	# Age-Eligible	# Pre-and Post-Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III	775	671	520	40	77.50% of age-eligible children with matched scores achieved a minimum 4-point standard score posttest gain. Eligible Cohort: Age-eligible children, as defined by the California Performance Indicator, include all children with valid pretest/posttest scores who completed a minimum of 6 months of instruction and children who achieved a 4-point gain with less than 6 months of instruction. 39 of the 40 exempted children were Not Able to be Tested (NATT) at pretest due to limited English language proficiency. By posttesting, 29 children (74% of English Learner children NATT at pretest) gained sufficient English skills to be tested on the PPVT-III.
PPVT-IV					Projects only use the PPVT-III.
TVIP					
Comments:					

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.4.1 Children Age-Eligible for Kindergarten Who Demonstrate Age-Appropriate Oral Language Skills

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year who have been in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took the PPVT-III or TVIP in the spring of the reporting year.
3. # who met goal includes children who score a Standard Score of 85 or higher on the spring PPVT-III
4. "Exempted" includes the number of children who could not take the test (based on the practice items) due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.

Note: Projects may use the PPVT-III or the PPVT-IV if the PPVT-III is no longer available, but results for the two versions of the assessment should be reported separately.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Who Met Goal	# Exempted	Explanation (if applicable)
PPVT-III					58.71% of age-eligible children achieved a standard score of 85 or higher on the spring PPVT-III. California serves a large English learner and low income population. We know that 66% of all children from native English speaking homes fall in the range of 85 to 115 standard scores. This data is based on English speaking children regardless of socio-economic status. Generally, children enter our program with
	775	700	411	11	significantly low English proficiency if compared to English speaking peers on which the norm is set at 75 standard scores. This indicator offers little about program effectiveness and focuses on the percentage of English learners and low income children served by Even Start programs. The pre to post gains on the PPVT-III demonstrate significant findings.
PPVT-IV					Projects only use the PPVT-III.
TVIP					Projects only use the PPVT-III.
Comments:					

Source – Manual input by the SEA using the online collection tool. Note: New collection for the SY 2007-08 CSPR. Proposed under OMB

2.2.2.5 The Average Number of Letters Children Can Identify as Measured by the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask

The following terms apply:

1. "Age-Eligible" includes the total number of children who are old enough to enter kindergarten in the school year following the reporting year who have been in Even Start for at least six months.
2. "Tested" includes the number of age-eligible children who took the PALS Pre-K Upper Case Letter Naming Subtask in the spring of 2008.
3. The term "average number of letters" includes the average score for the children in your State who participated in this assessment. This should be provided as a weighted average (An example of how to calculate a weighted average is included in the program training materials) and rounded to one decimal.
4. "Exempted" includes the number of children exempted from testing due to a severe disability or inability to understand the directions in English.

	# Age-Eligible	# Tested	# Exempted	Average Number of Letters (Weighted Average)	Explanation (if applicable)
PALS PreK Upper Case	775	698	0	19.0	90% of age-eligible children averaged 19 letters. The average of 19 letters is based on an analysis of 698 individual student scores-this is not a weighted average. Eligible Cohort: Age-eligible children, as defined by the California Performance Indicator, include all children with (a) pretest/posttest scores who completed a minimum of 6 months of instruction and (b) children who achieved the California target of 15 letters with less than 6 months. This cohort also includes children who do not have matched scores but who completed 6 months of instruction prior to Spring testing.
Comments:					

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.6 School-Aged Children Reading on Grade Level

In the table below, provide the number of school-age children who read on or above grade level ("met goal"). The source of these data is usually determined by the State and, in some cases, by school district. Please indicate the source(s) of the data in the "Explanation" field.

Grade	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (include source of data)
K	308	259	84.09% of eligible kindergarten students were rated by their teachers as "reading on grade level." Data Source: Students' end-of-year progress report cards. A determination of "at grade level" is based on the average rating of reading sub-skills listed on the student's report card. Grade appropriate reading skills are listed in the California Department of Education reading content standards for kindergarten. Eligible Cohort: Eligible children, as defined by the California Performance Indicator, include all children who received 100+ hours of supplemental academic support and children who are "reading at grade level" with less than 100 hours of academic support.
N<11	216	177	81.94% of eligible first grade students were rated by their teachers as "reading on grade level." Data Source: See above. Eligible Cohort: See above.

N<11			66.43% of eligible second grade students achieved a rating of "Proficient" or "Advanced" in English Language Arts.
	143	95	Data Source: California Star Test (CST), a standards-based test in English Language Arts is administered annually to students in grades 2+. The CST is correlated to the California Department of Education reading content standards for each grade level. Students who achieve scores of "Proficient" or "Advanced" are meeting the reading content standards for their grade level. Eligible Cohort: See above.
N<11	108	68	62.96% of eligible third grade students achieved a rating of "Proficient" or "Advanced" in English Language Arts. Data Source: See above. Eligible Cohort: See above.
Comments: There are several factors that contribute to the declining percentage of children reading at grade level in the upper grades. One key difference rests on the data we use to determine "reading on grade level." The definition of "reading on grade level" is based on teacher judgement which may vary throughout the state. There is no standardized state reporting or interpretation of "reading at grade level" for these students. Programs are directed to use the same criteria in reviewing report cards but report cards provide different information depending on the district. The data for grades 2 and 3 are based on the California Star Test scores, a standardized test.			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.2.2.7 Parents Who Show Improvement on Measures of Parental Support for Children's Learning in the Home, School Environment, and Through Interactive Learning Activities

In the table below, provide the number of parents who show improvement ("met goal") on measures of parental support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities.

While many states are using the PEP, other assessments of parenting education are acceptable. Please describe results and the source(s) of any non-PEP data in the "Other" field, with appropriate information in the Explanation field.

	# In Cohort	# Who Met Goal	Explanation (if applicable)
PEP Scale I	2,378	2,243	94.32% of eligible parents showed improvement by advancing one level on at least one of the four Scale I subscales. Eligible Cohort: Eligible parents, as defined by the California Performance Indicator, include all parents with pretest/posttest scores who received 8 months of parent education and those who achieved the Indicator in less than eight months.
PEP Scale II	2,349	2,204	93.83% of eligible parents showed improvement by advancing one level on at least one of the three Scale II subscales. Eligible Cohort: See above.
PEP Scale III	0	0	Projects are not required to administer Scale III.
PEP Scale IV	0	0	Projects are not required to administer Scale IV.
Other			
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3 EDUCATION OF MIGRANT CHILDREN (TITLE I, PART C)

This section collects data on the Migrant Education Program (Title I, Part C) for the reporting period of September 1, 2007 through August 31, 2008. This section is composed of the following subsections:

- Population data of eligible migrant children;
- Academic data of eligible migrant students;
- Participation data – migrant children served during either the regular school year, summer/intersession term, or program year;
- School data;
- Project data;
- Personnel data.

Where the table collects data by age/grade, report children in the highest age/grade that they attained during the reporting period. For example, a child who turns 3 during the reporting period would only be reported in the "Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)" row.

FAQs at 1.10 contain definitions of out-of-school and ungraded that are used in this section.

2.3.1 Population Data

The following questions collect data on eligible migrant children.

2.3.1.1 Eligible Migrant Children

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children by age/grade. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Eligible Migrant Children
Age birth through 2	9,008
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	21,592
K	9,725
1	8,549
2	13,460
3	12,698
4	12,510
5	12,471
6	12,189
7	12,377
8	12,434
9	12,079
10	11,786
11	11,717
12	14,265
Ungraded	451
Out-of-school	38,149
Total	225,460
Comments:	

Source – All rows except for "age birth through 2" are populated with the data provided in Part I, Section 1.10, Question 1.10.1.

2.3.1.2 Priority for Services

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children who have been classified as having "Priority for Services." The total is calculated automatically. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	23
1	321
2	531
3	818
4	877
5	857
6	850
7	860
8	837
9	795
10	751
11	774
12	670
Ungraded	30
Out-of-school	98
Total	9,092
Comments: The difference in the Total PFS counts between 2007 and 2008 reflect an overall decrease in the number of eligible students and a decrease in family moves.	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

FAQ on priority for services:

Who is classified as having "priority for service?" Migratory children who are failing, or most at risk of failing to meet the State's challenging academic content standards and student academic achievement standards, and whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year.

2.3.1.3 Limited English Proficient

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children who are also limited English proficient (LEP). The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Limited English Proficient (LEP)
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	0
K	4,402
1	7,534
2	10,650
3	9,649
4	9,050
5	8,284
6	7,399
7	6,512
8	6,003
9	5,411
10	4,922
11	4,580
12	2,321
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	0
Total	86,717
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

2.3.1.4 Children with Disabilities (IDEA)

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children who are also Children with Disabilities (IDEA) under Part B or Part C of the IDEA. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children with Disabilities (IDEA)
Age birth through 2	16
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	183
K	163
1	255
2	342
3	402
4	474
5	496
6	582
7	530
8	527
9	598
10	522
11	491
12	472
Ungraded	N<11
Out-of-school	84
Total	6,140
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

2.3.1.5 Last Qualifying Move

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children by when the last qualifying move occurred. The months are calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31. The totals are calculated automatically.

	Last Qualifying Move Is within X months from the last day of the reporting period			
Age/Grade	12 Months	Previous 13 – 24 Months	Previous 25 – 36 Months	Previous 37 – 48 Months
Age birth through 2	4,732	3,299	977	0
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	5,229	7,038	6,009	3,316
K	2,849	2,997	2,759	1,120
1	1,600	2,405	2,192	2,352
2	2,694	3,724	4,065	2,977
3	2,644	3,633	3,854	2,567
4	2,536	3,606	3,737	2,631
5	2,475	3,482	3,782	2,732
6	2,427	3,481	3,762	2,519
7	2,490	3,441	3,739	2,707
8	2,358	3,623	3,948	2,505
9	2,616	3,474	3,642	2,347
10	2,306	3,531	3,614	2,335
11	2,072	3,268	3,834	2,543
12	2,159	4,248	5,167	2,691
Ungraded	93	140	137	81
Out-of-school	12,240	11,775	9,082	5,052
Total	53,520	67,165	64,300	40,475
Comments:				

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.1.6 Qualifying Move During Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant children with any qualifying move during the regular school year within the previous 36 months calculated from the last day of the reporting period, August 31. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Move During Regular School Year
Age birth through 2	5,525
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	12,519
K	5,741
1	4,305
2	7,098
3	6,659
4	6,643
5	6,559
6	6,456
7	6,636
8	6,791
9	6,474
10	6,329
11	6,203
12	7,972
Ungraded	256
Out-of-school	22,776
Total	124,942
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

OMB NO. 1810-0614 Page 28

2.3.2 Academic Status

The following questions collect data about the academic status of eligible migrant students.

2.3.2.1 Dropouts

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant students who dropped out of school. The total is calculated automatically.

Grade	Dropped Out
7	41
8	59
9	148
10	198
11	290
12	1,298
Ungraded	N<11
Total	2,036
Comments: These data are preliminary and have not yet been certified by CDE.	

Source – Initially populated from ED Facts. See Attachment D: CSPR & ED Facts Data Crosswalk.

FAQ on Dropouts:

How is "dropped out of school" defined? The term used for students, who, during the reporting period, were enrolled in a public or private school for at least one day, but who subsequently left school with no plans on returning to enroll in a school and continue toward a high school diploma. Students who dropped out-of-school prior to the 2007-08 reporting period should be classified NOT as "dropped-out-of-school" but as "out-of-school youth."

2.3.2.2 GED

In the table below, provide the total unduplicated number of eligible migrant students who obtained a General Education Development (GED) Certificate in your state.

Obtained a GED in your state	134
Comments: We suspect that the increase in the number of migrant students enrolled in GED courses increase due to CAHSEE requirements. The MEP is researching the cause of this change.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.2.3 Participation in State NCLB Assessments

The following questions collect data about the participation of eligible migrant students in State NCLB Assessments.

2.3.2.3.1 Reading/Language Arts Participation

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of eligible migrant students enrolled in school during the State testing window and tested by the State NCLB reading/language arts assessment by grade level. The totals are calculated automatically.

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	9,784	8,171
4	9,838	8,218
5	9,820	8,283
6	9,552	8,379
7	9,671	8,457
8	9,537	8,585
9	9,378	8,156
10	9,266	7,747
11	8,635	7,367
12	7,267	0
Ungraded	240	0
Total	92,988	73,363
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

2.3.2.3.2 Mathematics Participation

This section is similar to 2.3.2.3.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on migrant students and the State's NCLB mathematics assessment.

Grade	Enrolled	Tested
3	9,784	8,219
4	9,838	8,271
5	9,820	8,326
6	9,552	8,381
7	9,671	8,273
8	9,537	8,503
9	9,378	8,029
10	9,266	6,896
11	8,635	6,226
12	7,267	0
Ungraded	240	0
Total	92,988	71,124
Comments:		

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

2.3.3 MEP Participation Data

The following questions collect data about the participation of migrant students served during the regular school year, summer/intersession term, or program year.

Unless otherwise indicated, participating migrant children include:

- Children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.
- Children who received a MEP-funded service, even those children who continued to receive services (1) during the term their eligibility ended, (2) for one additional school year after their eligibility ended, if comparable services were not available through other programs, and (3) in secondary school after their eligibility ended, and served through credit accrual programs until graduation (e.g., children served under the continuation of services authority, Section 1304(e)(1–3)).

Do not include:

- Children who were served through a Title I SWP where MEP funds were consolidated with those of other programs.
- Children who were served by a "referred" service only.

2.3.3.1 MEP Participation – Regular School Year

The following questions collect data on migrant children who participated in the MEP during the regular school year. Do not include:

- Children who were only served during the summer/intersession term.

2.3.3.1.1 MEP Students Served During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the regular school year. Do not count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Served During Regular School Year
Age Birth through 2	1,145
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	7,411
K	4,536
1	5,731
2	7,906
3	7,565
4	7,436
5	7,305
6	7,224
7	7,626
8	7,731
9	7,609
10	7,805
11	8,025
12	9,827
Ungraded	229
Out-of-school	13,438
Total	118,549
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

2.3.3.1.2 Priority for Services – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received instructional or support services during the regular school year. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	0
K	10
1	228
2	344
3	585
4	640
5	630
6	605
7	643
8	636
9	591
10	608
11	617
12	568
Ungraded	26
Out-of-school	54
Total	6,785
Comments: The difference in the Total PFS counts between 2007 and 2008 reflect an overall decrease in the number of eligible students and a decrease in family moves.	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

2.3.3.1.3 Continuation of Services – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received instructional or support services during the regular school year served under the continuation of services authority Sections 1304(e)(2)–(3). Do not include children served under Section 1304(e)(1), which are children whose eligibility expired during the school term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	14
K	N<11
1	N<11
2	12
3	N<11
4	N<11
5	N<11
6	N<11
7	10
8	48
9	N<11
10	10
11	12
12	20
Ungraded	N<11
Out-of-school	121
Total	294
Comments: The State provided fewer students under "Continuation of Services" than in previous years to target Priority for service students and increased the intensity of the services provided. The State also transitioned from a paper method of reword keeping to an electric method during this period.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.3.1.4 Services

The following questions collect data on the services provided to participating migrant children during the regular school year.

FAQ on Services:

What are services? Services are a subset of all allowable activities that the MEP can provide through its programs and projects. "Services" are those educational or educationally related activities that: (1) directly benefit a migrant child; (2) address a need of a migrant child consistent with the SEA's comprehensive needs assessment and service delivery plan; (3) are grounded in scientifically based research or, in the case of support services, are a generally accepted practice; and (4) are designed to enable the program to meet its measurable outcomes and contribute to the achievement of the State's performance targets. Activities related to identification and recruitment activities, parental involvement, program evaluation, professional development, or administration of the program are examples of allowable activities that are not considered services. Other examples of an allowable activity that would not be considered a service would be the one-time act of providing instructional packets to a child or family, and handing out leaflets to migrant families on available reading programs as part of an effort to increase the reading skills of migrant children. Although these are allowable activities, they are not services because they do not meet all of the criteria above.

2.3.3.1.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received any type of MEP-funded instructional service during the regular school year. Include children who received instructional services provided by either a teacher or a paraprofessional. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a service intervention. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	354
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	4,108
K	2,586
1	3,271
2	4,626
3	4,370
4	4,420
5	4,219
6	3,823
7	3,722
8	3,712
9	3,203
10	3,023
11	3,429
12	4,902
Ungraded	90
Out-of-school	5,619
Total	59,477
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.3.1.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

In the table below, provide the number of participating migrant children reported in the table above who received reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the regular school year. Include children who received such instructional services provided by a teacher only. Children may be reported as having received more than one type of instructional service in the table. However, children should be reported only once within each type of instructional service that they received regardless of the frequency with which they received the instructional service. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	225	64	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,874	1,243	
K	1,316	944	
1	1,902	1,035	
2	2,762	1,614	
3	2,515	1,489	
4	2,541	1,523	
5	2,332	1,496	
6	2,192	1,404	
7	2,126	1,323	
8	2,171	1,423	
9	1,572	938	887
10	1,351	633	1,314
11	1,428	679	1,948
12	2,119	962	2,061
Ungraded	53	12	0
Out-of-school	1,224	734	0
Total	29,703	17,516	6,210
Comments: Researching differences.			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

What is "high school credit accrual"? Instruction in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation provided by a teacher for students on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time. Includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher.

2.3.3.1.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

In the table below, in the column titled Support Services, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received any MEP-funded support service during the regular school year. In the column titled Counseling Service, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received a counseling service during the regular school year. Children should be reported only once in each column regardless of the frequency with which they received a support service intervention. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	1,031	292
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	6,544	2,442
K	3,934	1,784
1	4,923	2,431
2	6,814	3,041
3	6,591	2,872
4	6,467	2,848
5	6,376	2,842
6	6,416	2,918
7	6,812	3,392
8	6,815	3,306
9	7,213	3,795
10	7,611	4,804
11	7,772	5,132
12	9,474	6,732
Ungraded	209	138
Out-of-school	12,412	7,676
Total	107,414	56,445
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on Support Services:

- What are support services? These MEP-funded services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migrant families; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. The one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.*
- What are counseling services? Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counselees, between students and students, and between counselors and other staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy.*

2.3.3.1.4.4 Referred Service – During the Regular School Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who, during the regular school year, received an educational or educationally related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a referred service. Include children who were served by a referred service only or who received both a referred service and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who were referred, but received no services. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	180
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	1,402
K	915
1	1,074
2	1,575
3	1,585
4	1,519
5	1,492
6	1,407
7	1,713
8	1,567
9	1,388
10	1,178
11	1,387
12	1,550
Ungraded	23
Out-of-school	2,571
Total	22,526
Comments: comment	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.3.2 MEP Participation – Summer/Intersession Term

The questions in this subsection are similar to the questions in the previous section. There are two differences. First, the questions in this subsection collect data on the summer/intersession term instead of the regular school year. The second is the source for the table on migrant students served during the summer/intersession is EDFacts file N/X124 that includes data group 637, category set A.

2.3.3.2.1 MEP Students Served During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term. Do not count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Served During Summer/Intersession Term
Age Birth through 2	981
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	11,361
K	4,519
1	7,434
2	7,951
3	7,592
4	7,476
5	7,487
6	7,078
7	6,897
8	5,773
9	6,554
10	6,013
11	5,783
12	2,566
Ungraded	131
Out-of-school	8,660
Total	104,256
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

2.3.3.2.2 Priority for Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who have been classified as having "priority for services" and who received instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Priority for Services
Age 3 through 5	0
K	10
1	235
2	357
3	599
4	686
5	661
6	589
7	623
8	456
9	529
10	433
11	493
12	165
Ungraded	N<11
Out-of-school	74
Total	5,917
Comments: The difference in the counts between 2007 and 2008 are due the decrease in th number of eligible migrant children, less frequent family moves and fewer students having school interruptions during the school year.	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

2.3.3.2.3 Continuation of Services – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received instructional or support services during the summer/intersession term served under the continuation of services authority Sections 1304(e)(2)–(3). Do not include children served under Section 1304(e)(1), which are children whose eligibility expired during the school term. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Continuation of Services
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	24
K	N<11
1	13
2	11
3	24
4	26
5	24
6	21
7	N<11
8	12
9	24
10	35
11	43
12	52
Ungraded	0
Out-of-school	82
Total	404
Comments: The State provided fewer students under "Continuation of Services" than in previous years to target Priority for service students and increased the intensity of the services provided. The State also transitioned from a paper method of reword keeping to an electric method during this period.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.3.2.4 Services

The following questions collect data on the services provided to participating migrant children during the summer/intersession term.

FAQ on Services:

*What are services? Services are a subset of all allowable activities that the MEP can provide through its programs and projects. "Services" are those educational or educationally related activities that: (1) directly benefit a migrant child; (2) address a need of a migrant child consistent with the SEA's comprehensive needs assessment and service delivery plan; (3) are grounded in scientifically based research or, in the case of support services, are a generally accepted practice; and (4) are designed to enable the program to meet its measurable outcomes and contribute to the achievement of the State's performance targets. Activities related to identification and recruitment activities, parental involvement, program evaluation, professional development, or administration of the program are examples of allowable activities that are **NOT** considered services. Other examples of an allowable activity that would **not** be considered a service would be the one-time act of providing instructional packets to a child or family, and handing out leaflets to migrant families on available reading programs as part of an effort to increase the reading skills of migrant children. Although these are allowable activities, they are not services because they do not meet all of the criteria above.*

2.3.3.2.4.1 Instructional Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received any type of MEP-funded instructional service during the summer/intersession term. Include children who received instructional services provided by either a teacher or a paraprofessional. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a service intervention. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children Receiving an Instructional Service
Age birth through 2	356
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	9,558
K	3,852
1	6,304
2	6,769
3	6,333
4	6,327
5	6,407
6	5,986
7	5,898
8	4,909
9	4,723
10	4,445
11	4,298
12	1,805
Ungraded	71
Out-of-school	4,539
Total	82,580
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.3.2.4.2 Type of Instructional Service

In the table below, provide the number of participating migrant children reported in the table above who received reading instruction, mathematics instruction, or high school credit accrual during the summer/intersession term. Include children who received such instructional services provided by a teacher only. Children may be reported as having received more than one type of instructional service in the table. However, children should be reported only once within each type of instructional service that they received regardless of the frequency with which they received the instructional service. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Reading Instruction	Mathematics Instruction	High School Credit Accrual
Age birth through 2	168	131	
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	4,703	4,085	
K	2,555	2,317	
1	4,026	3,448	
2	4,310	3,625	
3	4,064	3,476	
4	3,994	3,382	
5	4,069	3,421	
6	3,600	3,056	
7	3,462	3,140	
8	2,874	2,447	
9	2,560	2,143	616
10	2,523	2,010	767
11	2,367	1,821	840
12	1,153	651	634
Ungraded	35	28	0
Out-of-school	1,415	1,091	0
Total	47,878	40,272	2,857
Comments:			

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQ on Types of Instructional Services:

What is "high school credit accrual"? Instruction in courses that accrue credits needed for high school graduation provided by a teacher for students on a regular or systematic basis, usually for a predetermined period of time. Includes correspondence courses taken by a student under the supervision of a teacher.

2.3.3.2.4.3 Support Services with Breakout for Counseling Service

In the table below, in the column titled Support Services, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received any MEP-funded support service during the summer/intersession term. In the column titled Counseling Service, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received a counseling service during the summer/intersession term. Children should be reported only once in each column regardless of the frequency with which they received a support service intervention. The totals are calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Children Receiving Support Services	Breakout of Children Receiving Counseling Service
Age birth through 2	893	199
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	7,795	2,504
K	2,918	969
1	4,366	1,459
2	4,698	1,646
3	4,675	1,696
4	4,660	1,699
5	4,852	1,859
6	4,481	1,721
7	4,274	1,693
8	3,476	1,477
9	4,620	2,235
10	4,249	2,358
11	4,056	2,342
12	2,149	1,411
Ungraded	108	58
Out-of-school	6,706	4,392
Total	68,976	29,718
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on Support Services:

- What are support services? These MEP-funded services include, but are not limited to, health, nutrition, counseling, and social services for migrant families; necessary educational supplies, and transportation. The one-time act of providing instructional or informational packets to a child or family does not constitute a support service.*
- What are counseling services? Services to help a student to better identify and enhance his or her educational, personal, or occupational potential; relate his or her abilities, emotions, and aptitudes to educational and career opportunities; utilize his or her abilities in formulating realistic plans; and achieve satisfying personal and social development. These activities take place between one or more counselors and one or more students as counselees, between students and students, and between counselors and other staff members. The services can also help the child address life problems or personal crisis that result from the culture of migrancy.*

2.3.3.2.4.4 Referred Service – During the Summer/Intersession Term

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who, during the summer/intersession term, received an educational or educationally related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise received without efforts supported by MEP funds. Children should be reported only once regardless of the frequency with which they received a referred service. Include children who were served by a referred service only or who received both a referred service and MEP-funded services. Do not include children who were referred, but received no services. The total is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Referred Service
Age birth through 2	48
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	2,191
K	830
1	1,363
2	1,482
3	1,519
4	1,514
5	1,613
6	1,514
7	1,436
8	1,107
9	1,129
10	976
11	891
12	343
Ungraded	27
Out-of-school	1,961
Total	19,944
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.3.3.3 MEP Participation – Program Year

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of participating migrant children who received MEP-funded instructional or support services at any time during the program year. Do not count the number of times an individual child received a service intervention. The total number of students served is calculated automatically.

Age/Grade	Served During the Program Year
Age Birth through 2	1,712
Age 3 through 5 (not Kindergarten)	12,807
K	6,253
1	7,523
2	10,441
3	9,962
4	9,855
5	9,705
6	9,582
7	9,594
8	9,312
9	9,357
10	9,153
11	9,393
12	11,023
Ungraded	279
Out-of-school	18,722
Total	154,673
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

2.3.4 School Data

The following questions are about the enrollment of eligible migrant children in schools during the regular school year.

2.3.4.1 Schools and Enrollment

In the table below, provide the number of public schools that enrolled eligible migrant children at any time during the regular school year. Schools include public schools that serve school age (e.g., grades K through 12) children. Also, provide the number of eligible migrant children who were enrolled in those schools. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child at some time during the year, the number of children may include duplicates.

	#
Number of schools that enrolled eligible migrant children	4,294
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	145,967
Comments:	

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

2.3.4.2 Schools Where MEP Funds Were Consolidated in Schoolwide Programs

In the table below, provide the number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in an SWP. Also, provide the number of eligible migrant children who were enrolled in those schools at any time during the regular school year. Since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child at some time during the year, the number of children may include duplicates.

	#
Number of schools where MEP funds were consolidated in a schoolwide program	0
Number of eligible migrant children enrolled in those schools	0

Comments:

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

2.3.5 MEP Project Data

The following questions collect data on MEP projects.

2.3.5.1 Type of MEP Project

In the table below, provide the number of projects that are funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. A MEP project is the entity that receives MEP funds by a subgrant from the State or through an intermediate entity that receives the subgrant and provides services directly to the migrant child. Do not include projects where MEP funds were consolidated in SWP.

Also, provide the number of migrant children participating in the projects. Since children may participate in more than one project, the number of children may include duplicates.

Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Type of MEP Project	Number of MEP Projects	Number of Migrant Children Participating in the Projects
Regular school year – school day only	541	85,883
Regular school year – school day/extended day	446	60,148
Summer/intersession only	789	87,455
Year round	456	114,891

Comments: The difference between the number of students participating in school day/extended day projects from the previous year's total is due to school districts and migrant regions increasing the number of students served in school day only and year round services.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on type of MEP project:

- a. *What is a project? A project is any entity that receives MEP funds either as a subgrantee or from a subgrantee and provides services directly to migrant children in accordance with the State Service Delivery Plan and State approved subgrant applications. A project's services may be provided in one or more sites.*
- b. *What are Regular School Year – School Day Only projects? Projects where all MEP services are provided during the school day during the regular school year.*
- c. *What are Regular School Year – School Day/Extended Day projects? Projects where some or all MEP services are provided during an extended day or week during the regular school year (e.g., some services are provided during the school day and some outside of the school day; e.g., all services are provided outside of the school day).*
- d. *What are Summer/Intersession Only projects? Projects where all MEP services are provided during the summer/intersession term.*
- e. *What are Year Round projects? Projects where all MEP services are provided during the regular school year and summer/intersession term.*

2.3.6 MEP Personnel Data

The following questions collect data on MEP personnel data.

2.3.6.1 Key MEP Personnel

The following questions collect data about the key MEP personnel.

2.3.6.1.1 MEP State Director

In the table below, provide the FTE amount of time the State director performs MEP duties (regardless of whether the director is funded by State, MEP, or other funds) during the reporting period (e.g., September 1 through August 31). Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

State Director FTE	1.00
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on the MEP State director

- How is the FTE calculated for the State director? Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked for the MEP. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE for the State director in your State for the reporting period. To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the State director worked for the MEP during the reporting period and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in the reporting period.*
- Who is the State director? The manager within the SEA who administers the MEP on a statewide basis.*

2.3.6.1.2 MEP Staff

In the table below, provide the headcount and FTE by job classification of the staff funded by the MEP. Do not include staff employed in SWP where MEP funds were combined with those of other programs. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

Job Classification	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Teachers	1,015	545.34	1,001	835.74
Counselors	65	49.74	81	76.30
All paraprofessionals	1,001	616.98	1,153	850.37
Recruiters	353	299.83	299	259.35
Records transfer staff	102	71.94	60	53.01
Comments: Differences from prior yer: Teachers -The differences from the previous year's Headcount and FTE was due to a decrease in the number of eligible students. Recruiters -The differences from the previous year's numbers are due to a decrease in the migrant student population. Records Transfer Staff -The difference from the previous year's Summer/Intersession Headcount numbers is due to a decrease in the population combined with increasing use of Tablet PCs by recruiters. Counselors -Additional counseling staff was employed to provide academic counseling and guidance, especially PFS students All paraprofessionals -Additional paraprofessional staff was employed during the regular school year and in summer/intersession to deliver additional tutoring and instructional support services.				

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

FAQs on MEP staff:

- How is the FTE calculated? The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:*
 - To calculate the FTE, in each job category, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
 - Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE for each job classification in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession

FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked in a particular job classification for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.

- b. *Who is a teacher? A classroom instructor who is licensed and meets any other teaching requirements in the State.*
- c. *Who is a counselor? A professional staff member who guides individuals, families, groups, and communities by assisting them in problem-solving, decision-making, discovering meaning, and articulating goals related to personal, educational, and career development.*
- d. *Who is a paraprofessional? An individual who: (1) provides one-on-one tutoring if such tutoring is scheduled at a time when a student would not otherwise receive instruction from a teacher; (2) assists with classroom management, such as organizing instructional and other materials; (3) provides instructional assistance in a computer laboratory; (4) conducts parental involvement activities; (5) provides support in a library or media center; (6) acts as a translator; or (7) provides instructional support services under the direct supervision of a teacher (Title I, Section 1119(g)(2)). Because a paraprofessional provides instructional support, he/she should not be providing planned direct instruction or introducing to students new skills, concepts, or academic content. Individuals who work in food services, cafeteria or playground supervision, personal care services, non-instructional computer assistance, and similar positions are not considered paraprofessionals under Title I.*
- e. *Who is a recruiter? A staff person responsible for identifying and recruiting children as eligible for the MEP and documenting their eligibility on the Certificate of Eligibility.*
- f. *Who is a record transfer staffer? An individual who is responsible for entering, retrieving, or sending student records from or to another school or student records system.*

2.3.6.1.3 Qualified Paraprofessionals

In the table below, provide the headcount and FTE of the qualified paraprofessionals funded by the MEP. Do not include staff employed in SWP where MEP funds were combined with those of other programs. Below the table are FAQs about the data collected in this table.

	Regular School Year		Summer/Intersession Term	
	Headcount	FTE	Headcount	FTE
Qualified paraprofessionals	566	331.69	728	502.16
Comments: Summer/Intersession Headcount and FTE -More qualified paraprofessionals employed to deliver additional tutoring and other instructional support during the summer				

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

FAQs on qualified paraprofessionals:

- a. *How is the FTE calculated? The FTE may be calculated using one of two methods:*
 1. To calculate the FTE, sum the percentage of time that staff were funded by the MEP and enter the total FTE for that category.
 2. Calculate the FTE using the number of days worked. To do so, first define how many full-time days constitute one FTE in your State for each term. (For example, one regular-term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days; one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days; or one intersession FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) To calculate the FTE number, sum the total days the individuals worked for a term and divide this sum by the number of full-time days that constitute one FTE in that term.
- b. *Who is a qualified paraprofessional? A qualified paraprofessional must have a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent and have (1) completed 2 years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate's (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Sections 1119(c) and (d) of ESEA).*

2.4 PREVENTION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN AND YOUTH WHO ARE NEGLECTED, DELINQUENT, OR AT RISK (TITLE I, PART D, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)

This section collects data on programs and facilities that serve students who are neglected, delinquent, or at risk under Title I, Part D, and characteristics about and services provided to these students.

Throughout this section:

- Report data for the program year of July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.
- Count programs/facilities based on how the program was classified to ED for funding purposes.
- Do not include programs funded solely through Title I, Part A.
- Use the definitions listed below:
 - **Adult Corrections:** An adult correctional institution is a facility in which persons, including persons 21 or under, are confined as a result of conviction for a criminal offense.
 - **At-Risk Programs:** Programs operated (through LEAs) that target students who are at risk of academic failure, have a drug or alcohol problem, are pregnant or parenting, have been in contact with the juvenile justice system in the past, are at least 1 year behind the expected age/grade level, have limited English proficiency, are gang members, have dropped out of school in the past, or have a high absenteeism rate at school.
 - **Juvenile Corrections:** An institution for delinquent children and youth is a public or private residential facility other than a foster home that is operated for the care of children and youth who have been adjudicated delinquent or in need of supervision. Include any programs serving adjudicated youth (including non-secure facilities and group homes) in this category.
 - **Juvenile Detention Facilities:** Detention facilities are shorter-term institutions that provide care to children who require secure custody pending court adjudication, court disposition, or execution of a court order, or care to children after commitment.
 - **Multiple Purpose Facility:** An institution/facility/program that serves more than one programming purpose. For example, the same facility may run both a juvenile correction program and a juvenile detention program.
 - **Neglected Programs:** An institution for neglected children and youth is a public or private residential facility, other than a foster home, that is operated primarily for the care of children who have been committed to the institution or voluntarily placed under applicable State law due to abandonment, neglect, or death of their parents or guardians.
 - **Other:** Any other programs, not defined above, which receive Title I, Part D funds and serve non-adjudicated children and youth.

2.4.1 State Agency Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities.

2.4.1.1 Programs and Facilities -Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the average length of stay by program/facility type, for these students. Report only programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. Make sure to identify the number of multipurpose facilities that were included in the facility/program count in the second table. The total number of programs/facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is a FAQ about the data collected in this table.

State Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay in Days
Neglected programs	0	
Juvenile detention	0	
Juvenile corrections	9	
Adult corrections	9	
Other	0	
Total	18	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

How many of the programs listed in the table above are in a multiple purpose facility?

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	
Comments: California does not collect data for average length of stay and multiple purpose facility.	

FAQ on Programs and Facilities -Subpart I:

How is average length of stay calculated? The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit, for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.

2.4.1.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported -Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of State agency programs/facilities that reported data on neglected and delinquent students.

The total row will be automatically calculated.

State Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
Neglected Programs	0
Juvenile Detention	0
Juvenile Corrections	9
Adult Corrections	9
Other	0
Total	18
Comments: California does not collect data for Other Programs	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.1.2 Students Served – Subpart 1

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in State agency Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 that are long-term. In the subsequent tables provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex and by age will be automatically calculated.

# of Students Served	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	0	0	1,089	1,169	
Long Term Students Served	0	0	1,089	1,169	

Race/Ethnicity	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	0	0	N<11	N<11	
Asian or Pacific Islander	0	0	24	57	
Black, non-Hispanic	0	0	529	560	
Hispanic	0	0	415	362	
White, non-Hispanic	0	0	113	187	
Total	0	0	1,089	1,169	

Sex	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Male	0	0	1,051	1,028	
Female	0	0	38	141	
Total	0	0	1,089	1,169	

Age	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
3 through 5	0	0	0	0	
6	0	0	0	0	
7	0	0	0	0	
8	0	0	0	0	
9	0	0	0	0	
10	0	0	0	0	
11	0	0	0	0	
12	0	0	0	0	
13	0	0	0	0	
14	0	0	0	0	
15	0	0	32	0	
16	0	0	0	0	
17	0	0	0	0	
18	0	0	742	86	
19	0	0	315	1,083	
20	0	0	0	0	
21	0	0	0	0	
Total	0	0	1,089	1,169	

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain in comment box below. This response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: California collects data in age ranges of 5-10 years old, 11-15 years old, 16-18 years old, and 19 and older. Also, California does not collect average length of stay or data for Other Programs.

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

What is an unduplicated count? An unduplicated count is one that counts students only once, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.

2.4.1.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the number of programs/facilities (not students) that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 funds and awarded at least one high school course credit, one high school diploma, and/or one GED within the reporting year. Include programs/facilities that directly awarded a credit, diploma, or GED, as well as programs/facilities that made awards through another agency. The numbers should not exceed those reported earlier in the facility counts.

# Programs That	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Awarded high school course credit(s)	0	8	3	
Awarded high school diploma(s)	0	6	2	
Awarded GED(s)	0	7	9	
Comments: California does not collect data for Other Programs.				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.1.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 1

The following questions collect academic outcome data on students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 1.

2.4.1.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the State agency program/facility by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections Facilities	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits	0	796	31	
Enrolled in a GED program	0	236	240	
Comments: California does not collect data for Other Programs.				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.1.4.2 Academic Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 30 Calendar Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the State agency program/facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school	0	0	20	
Earned a GED	0	62	112	
Obtained high school diploma	0	41	3	
Were accepted into post-secondary education	0	0	39	
Enrolled in post-secondary education	0	25	39	
Comments: California does not collect data for Other Programs.				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.1.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on vocational outcomes of students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 1.

2.4.1.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the State agency program by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs			117	
Comments: California cannot collect this data due to California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation regulations and does not collect data for Other Programs.				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.1.5.2 Vocational Outcomes While in the State Agency Program/Facility or Within 30 Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the State agency program/facility or within 30 days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention Facilities	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education				
Obtained employment				
Comments: California cannot collect this data due to California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation regulations and does not collect data for Other Programs.				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.1.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 1

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1 in reading and mathematics.

2.4.1.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 1

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 1, who participated in pre- and post-testing in reading. Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pretested prior to July 1, 2007, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	0	738	458	
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	0	719	388	

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams	0	165	111	
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	108	32	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	42	39	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	80	31	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	324	175	
Comments: California does not collect data for Other Programs.				

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

FAQ on long-term students:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.

2.4.1.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 1

This section is similar to 2.4.1.6.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on mathematics performance.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	0	669	216	
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	0	690	139	

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Adult Corrections	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams	0	158	27	
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	105	19	
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	37	28	
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	109	N<11	
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	0	281	58	
Comments: California does not collect data for Other Programs.				

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

2.4.2 LEA Title I, Part D Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities.

2.4.2.1 Programs and Facilities – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities that serve neglected and delinquent students and the yearly average length of stay by program/facility type for these students. Report only the programs and facilities that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funding during the reporting year. Count a facility once if it offers only one type of program. If a facility offers more than one type of program (i.e., it is a multipurpose facility), then count each of the separate programs. Make sure to identify the number of multipurpose facilities that were included in the facility/program count in the second table. The total number of programs/facilities will be automatically calculated. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Programs/Facilities	Average Length of Stay (# days)
At-risk programs	107	
Neglected programs	255	
Juvenile detention	602	
Juvenile corrections	249	
Other		
Total	1,213	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

How many of the programs listed in the table above are in a multiple purpose facility?

	#
Programs in a multiple purpose facility	
Comments: California does not collect the average length of stay, Other Programs, or the number of programs in a multiple purpose facility.	

FAQ on average length of stay:

How is average length of stay calculated? The average length of stay should be weighted by number of students and should include the number of days, per visit for each student enrolled during the reporting year, regardless of entry or exit date. Multiple visits for students who entered more than once during the reporting year can be included. The average length of stay in days should not exceed 365.

2.4.2.1.1 Programs and Facilities That Reported -Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on neglected and delinquent students. The

total row will be automatically calculated.

LEA Program/Facility Type	# Reporting Data
At-risk programs	34
Neglected programs	23
Juvenile detention	61
Juvenile corrections	0
Other	
Total	118
Comments: California does not collect data for Other Programs.	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.2.2 Students Served – Subpart 2

In the tables below, provide the number of neglected and delinquent students served in LEA Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 programs and facilities. Report only students who received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 services during the reporting year. In the first table, provide in row 1 the unduplicated number of students served by each program, and in row 2, the total number of students in row 1 who are long-term. In the subsequent tables, provide the number of students served by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age. The total number of students by race/ethnicity, by sex, and by age will be automatically calculated.

# of Students Served	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Total Unduplicated Students Served	14,822	5,357	64,066	0	
Total Long Term Students Served	14,822	5,357	64,066	0	

Race/Ethnicity	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
American Indian or Alaska Native	249	56	726	0	
Asian or Pacific Islander	707	339	2,211	0	
Black, non-Hispanic	8,007	1,929	33,784	0	
Hispanic	1,956	1,760	15,063	0	
White, non-Hispanic	3,843	1,233	12,164		
Total	14,762	5,317	63,948	0	

Sex	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
Male	10,373	2,734	51,735	0	
Female	4,449	2,623	12,331	0	
Total	14,822	5,357	64,066	0	

Age	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention	Juvenile Corrections	Other Programs
3-5	0	0	0	0	
6	0	0	0	0	
7	0	0	0	0	
8	0	0	0	0	
9	0	0	0	0	
10	182	623	187	0	
11	0	0	0	0	
12	0	0	0	0	
13	0	0	0	0	
14	0	0	0	0	
15	4,365	2,645	17,310	0	
16	0	0	0	0	
17	0	0	0	0	
18	9,578	2,007	44,721	0	
19	697	82	1,848	0	
20	0	0	0	0	
21	0	0	0	0	
Total	14,822	5,357	64,066	0	

If the total number of students differs by demographics, please explain. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Comments: California had 60 students in At-Risk Programs, 40 students in Neglected Programs, and 118 students in Juvenile

Detention that declined to state their Race/Ethnicity. Also, California collects student ages in ranges of 5-10, 11-15, 16-18 and 19 years and older and does not collect data for Other Programs.

FAQ on Unduplicated Count:

What is an unduplicated count? An unduplicated count is one that counts students only once, even if they were admitted to a facility or program multiple times within the reporting year.

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008.

2.4.2.3 Programs/Facilities Academic Offerings – Subpart 2

In the table below, provide the number of programs/facilities (not students) that received Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 funds and awarded at least one high school course credit, one high school diploma, and/or one GED within the reporting year. Include programs/facilities that directly awarded a credit, diploma, or GED, as well as programs/facilities that made awards through another agency. The numbers should not exceed those reported earlier in the facility counts.

LEA Programs That	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Detention/ Corrections	Other Programs
Awarded high school course credit(s)		171	182	
Awarded high school diploma(s)		170	159	
Awarded GED(s)		5	65	
Comments: California does not collect the data for At-Risk or Other Programs.				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.2.4 Academic Outcomes – Subpart 2

The following questions collect academic outcome data on students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 2.

2.4.2.4.1 Academic Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the LEA program/facility by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Earned high school course credits		1,956	48,867	
Enrolled in a GED program		97	2,375	
Comments: California does not collect data for At-Risk or Other Programs.				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.2.4.2 Academic Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 30 Calendar Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained academic outcomes while in the LEA program/facility or within 30 calendar days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in their local district school		1,855	17,683	
Earned a GED		31	1,186	
Obtained high school diploma		157	772	
Were accepted into post-secondary education		114	198	
Enrolled in post-secondary education		94	169	
Comments: California does not collect data for At-Risk or Other Programs.				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.2.5 Vocational Outcomes – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on vocational outcomes of students served through Title I, Part D, Subpart 2.

2.4.2.5.1 Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the LEA program by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in elective job training courses/programs		414	8,960	
Comments: California does not collect data for At-Risk or Other Programs.				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.2.5.2 Vocational Outcomes While in the LEA Program/Facility or Within 30 Days After Exit

In the table below, provide the unduplicated number of students who attained vocational outcomes while in the LEA program/facility or within 30 days after exit, by type of program/facility.

# of Students Who	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Enrolled in external job training education		128	891	
Obtained employment		133	1,165	
Comments: California does not collect data for At-Risk or Other Programs.				

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.4.2.6 Academic Performance – Subpart 2

The following questions collect data on the academic performance of neglected and delinquent students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2 in reading and mathematics.

2.4.2.6.1 Academic Performance in Reading – Subpart 2

In the format of the table below, provide the unduplicated number of long-term students served by Title I, Part D, Subpart 2, who participated in pre-and post-testing in reading. Report only information on a student's most recent testing data. Students who were pre-tested prior to July 1, 2007, may be included if their post-test was administered during the reporting year. Students who were post-tested after the reporting year ended should be counted in the following year. Throughout the table, report numbers for juvenile detention and correctional facilities together in a single column. Students should be reported in only one of the five change categories in the second table below. Below the table is an FAQ about the data collected in this table.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	1,037	1,747	9,285	152
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	584	1,021	9,577	138

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams	107	203	2,487	11
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	127	144	2,483	22
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	191	205	1,252	33
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	74	189	917	30
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	85	280	2,438	42
Comments:				

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

FAQ on long-term:

What is long-term? Long-term refers to students who were enrolled for at least 90 consecutive calendar days from July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008.

2.4.2.6.2 Academic Performance in Mathematics – Subpart 2

This section is similar to 2.4.2.6.1. The only difference is that this section collects data on mathematics performance.

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Long-term students who tested below grade level upon entry	947	1,874	9,567	162
Long-term students who have complete pre-and post-test results (data)	689	998	9,580	138

Of the students reported in the second row above, indicate the number who showed:

Performance Data (Based on most recent pre/post-test data)	At-Risk Programs	Neglected Programs	Juvenile Corrections/ Detention	Other Programs
Negative grade level change from the pre-to post-test exams	150	321	2,814	9
No change in grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	174	161	2,494	12
Improvement of up to 1/2 grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	135	186	1,163	30
Improvement from 1/2 up to one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	93	129	797	57
Improvement of more than one full grade level from the pre-to post-test exams	137	201	2,312	30
Comments:				

Source – Initially populated from EDFacts. See Attachment D: CSPR & EDFacts Data Crosswalk.

2.7 SAFE AND DRUG FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT (TITLE IV, PART A)

This section collects data on student behaviors under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act.

2.7.1 Performance Measures

In the table below, provide actual performance data.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
The percentage of students that think frequent use of marijuana is extremely harmful.	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	12th Biennial (2007-08) CSS	2005-06: 7th (+1.0%) 9th (+1.0%) 11th (+1.0%)	2005-06: 7th (81.9%) 9th (66.0%) 11th (56.9%)	7th (82.0%) 9th (66.6%) 11th (56.6%)	2001-02
				2006-07: 7th (81.9%) 9th (66.0%) 11th (56.9%)			
				2007-08: 7th (56.0%) 9th (54.0%) 11th (44.1%)			
Comments: SAMHSA NOMs question has replaced the prior perceived harm question. The question is now "How much do people risk harming themselves physically or in other ways when they smoke marijuana once or twice/week?" This may account for the change in the actual performance when comparing 2006-07 to 2007-08. NOTE: A request was made to EDEN, on 2/11/09, to revise the baseline because of the change in the question. No response received to date.							

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
-----------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------	-----------------------	----------	---------------------------------

				2005-06: 7th (-0.5%) 9th (-1.0%) 11th (-1.0%)	2005-06: 7th (4.7%) 9th (12.6%) 11th (19.2%)		
The percentage of students that have used marijuana within the last 30 days.	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	12th Biennial (2007-08) CSS Survey	2006-07: 7th (-0.5%) 9th (-1.0%) 11th (-1.0%)	2006-07: 7th (4.7%) 9th (12.6%) 11th (19.2%)	7th (4.0%) 9th (13.4%) 11th (23.0%)	2001-02
				2007-08: 7th (6.6%) 9th (15.4%) 11th (23.9%)			
Comments:							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
The percentage of students that have been drunk or high at school.	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	12th Biennial (2007-08) CSS	2005-06: 7th (-0.5%) 9th (-1.0%) 11th (-2.0%)	2005-06: 7th (4.5%) 9th (12.8%) 11th (23.2%)	7th (3.3%) 9th (13.5%) 11th (27.0%)	2001-02
				2006-07: 7th (4.5%) 9th (12.8%) 11th (23.2%)			
				2007-08: 7th (5.7%) 9th (13.1%) 11th (24.5%)			

Comments: In 2007-08, the response options were expanded from four to six categories, which may affect the survey results. Interpret results with caution. NOTE: A request was made to EDEN, on 2/11/09, to revise the baseline because of the change in the question. No response received to date.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
The percentage of students that have used alcohol in the last 30 days.	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	12th Biennial (2007-08) CSS	2005-06: 7th (-1.0%) 9th (-2.0%) 11th (-2.0%)	2005-06: 7th (12.0%) 9th (23.8%) 11th (35.8%)	7th (10.4%) 9th (29.3%) 11th (40.7%)	2001-02
				2006-07: 7th (12.0%) 9th (23.8%) 11th (35.8%)			
				2007-08: 7th (14.8%) 9th (27.3%) 11th (41.9%)			

Comments:

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2005 06: 7th (0.5%) 9th (-1.0%)	2005-06: 7th (7.9%)		

				11th (2.0%)	9th (22.3%) 11th (38.2%)		
				07: 7th (0.5%) 9th (-1.0%) 11th (2.0%)	2006-07: 7th (7.9%) 9th (22.3%) 11th (38.2%)		
				2007-08: 7th (0.5%) 9th (-1.0%) 11th (2.0%)	(9.4%) 9th (24.6%) 11th (41.6%)		
				09: 7th (0.5%) 9th (-1.0%) 11th (2.0%)			

				2.0%)			
The percentage of students that have ever used marijuana.	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	12th Biennial (2007-08) CSS			7th (8.5%) 9th (24.1%) 11th (44.0%)	2001-02

Comments: In 2007-08, the response options were expanded from four to six categories, which may affect the survey results. Interpret results with caution. NOTE: A request was made to EDEN, on 2/11/09, to revise the baseline because of the change in the question. No response received to date.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
The percentage of students that have ever used inhalants.	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	12th Biennial (2007-08) CSS	2005-06: 7th (-0.5%) 9th (-0.5%) 11th (-0.5%)	2005-06: 7th (7.8%) 9th (10.2%) 11th (9.5%)	7th (6.3%) 9th (9.4%) 11th (12.6%)	2001-02
				2006-07: 7th (7.8%) 9th (10.2%) 11th (9.5%)			
				2007-08: 7th (11.5%) 9th (14.1%) 11th (15.2%)			

Comments: In 2007-08, the response options were expanded from four to six categories, which may affect the survey results. Interpret results with caution. NOTE: A request was made to EDEN, on 2/11/09, to revise the baseline because of the change in the question. No response received to date.

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2005-06: 7th (-0.5%) 9th (-0.5%) 11th (-0.5%)	2005-06: 7th (2.7%) 9th (5.2%) 11th (8.3%)		
				2006-07: 7th (2.7%)			

				11th (-0.5%)	9th (5.2%) 11th (8.3%)		
				2007-08: 7th (4.1%) 9th (6.1%) 11th (10.1%)			
The percentage of students that have ever used smokeless tobacco.	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	12th Biennial (2007-08) CSS			7th (2.4%) 9th (4.8%) 11th (8.6%)	2001-02

Comments: In 2007-08, the response options were expanded from four to six categories, which may affect the survey results. Interpret results with caution. NOTE: A request was made to EDEN, on 2/11/09, to revise the baseline because of the change in the question. No response received to date.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
-----------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------	-----------------------	----------	---------------------------------

The percentage of students that think frequent use of cigarettes is extremely harmful.	California Student Survey (CSS0	Biennial	12th Biennial (2007-08) CSS	2005-06: 7th (+1.0%) 9th (+1.0%) 11th (+1.0%)	2005-06: 7th (67.5%) 9th (56.8%) 11th (59.0%)	7th (63.6%) 9th (61.6%) 11th (66.1%)	2001-02
				2006-07: 7th (67.5%) 9th (56.8%) 11th (59.0%)			
				2007-08: 7th (64.4%) 9th (72.0%) 11th (77.7%)			
Comments: SAMHSA NOMs question has replaced the prior perceived harm question. The question is now "How much do							

people risk harming themselves physically or in other ways when they smoke 1-2 packs cigarettes/day?" This may account for the change in the actual performance. As a result of the change, the 2007-08 results are not comparable to the prior data. NOTE: A request was made to EDEN, on 2/11/09, to revise the baseline because of the change in the question. No response received to date.

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
The percentage of students that have used cigarettes in the last 30 days.	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	12th Biennial (2007-08) CSS	2005-06: 7th (-0.5%) 9th (-1.0%) 11th (-1.0%)	2005-06: 7th (5.1%) 9th (10.0%) 11th (15.2%)	7th (4.3%) 9th (11.1%) 11th (18.9%)	2001-02
				2006-07: 7th (5.1%) 9th (10.0%) 11th (15.2%)			

				2007-08: 7th (5.6%) 9th (11.1%) 11th (17.4%)			

Comments: In 2007-08, the response categories expanded from five to six options. As a result, this may have affected the survey results. **NOTE:** A request was made to EDEN, on 2/11/09, to revise the baseline because of the change in the question. No response received to date.

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2005 06: 7th (0.5%) 9th (-1.0%) 11th (2.0%)	2005-06: 7th (7.5%) 9th (16.0%) 11th (28.0%)		
				07: 7th (0.5%) 9th (-1.0%) 11th (2.0%)	2006-07: 7th (7.5%) 9th (16.0%) 11th (28.0%)		
				2007-08: 7th 08: 7th (0.5%) 9th (-1.0%)	(7.1%) 9th (20.4%) 11th (33.6%)		
The percentage of students that have ever used cigarettes.	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	12th Biennial (2007-08) CSS	11th (-2.0%)		7th (6.9%) 9th (20.7%) 11th (35.7%)	2001-02

Comments: The percentage of students referred to here are those students who have smoked a whole cigarette. It does not include students that may have taken a puff from a cigarette. Additionally, in 2007-08, the response options increased from four to six categories. This may have affected the survey results. NOTE: A request was made to EDEN, on 2/11/09, to revise the baseline because of the change in the question. No response received to date.							

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
The percentage of students that have ever been in a physical fight in the past 12 months.	California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	12th Biennial (2007-08) CSS	2005-06: 7th (-1.0%) 9th (-1.0%) 11th (-1.0%)	2005-06: 7th (32.0%) 9th (25.1%) 11th (20.0%)	7th (27.2%) 9th (23.7%) 11th (19.0%)	2001-02
				2006-07: 7th (32.0%) 9th (25.1%) 11th (20.0%)			
				2007-08: 7th (32.2%) 9th (24.6%) 11th (22.8%)			

Comments:

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool. Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
				2005-06: 7th (-0.1%) 9th (-0.2%)	2005-06: 7th (1.8%)		
The percentage of students that have used	California Student	Biennial	12th Biennial (2007-08)	11th (-0.3%)	9th (2.7%) 11th (3.2%)	7th (0.8%)	2001-02

smokeless tobacco in the past 30 days.	Survey (CSS)		CSS	2006-07: 7th (1.8%) 9th (2.7%) 11th (3.2%)		9th (1.4%) 11th (2.8%)	
				2007-08: 7th (2.8%) 9th (5.3%) 11th (6.3%)			

Comments: In 2007-08, the survey response options expanded from five to six categories, which may have affected the results. Interpret results with caution. NOTE: A request was made to EDEN, on 2/11/09, to revise the baseline because of the change in the question. No response received to date.

Performance Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of Collection	Year of most recent collection	Targets	Actual Performance	Baseline	Year Baseline Established
<p>●●●● 200607: 7th (-0.5%) 9th (-0.5%) 11th (-0.5%)</p> <p>●●●● 200708: 7th (-0.5%) 9th (-0.5%) 11th (-0.5%)</p> <p>●●●● 200809: 7th (-0.5%) 9th (-0.5%) 11th (-0.5%)</p>			<p>200607: 7th (-0.5%) 9th (-0.5%) 11th (-0.5%)</p> <p>200708: 7th (-0.5%) 9th (-0.5%) 11th (-0.5%)</p> <p>200809: 7th (-0.5%) 9th (-0.5%) 11th (-0.5%)</p>	<p>2005-06: 7th (-0.5%) 9th (-0.5%) 11th (-0.5%)</p> <p>2006-07: 7th (2.4%) 9th (4.6%) 11th (6.0%)</p> <p>2007-08: 7th (2.8%) 9th (7.0%) 11th (7.4%)</p>	<p>2005-06: 7th (2.4%) 9th (4.6%) 11th (6.0%)</p>	<p>7th (1.8%) 9th (4.3%) 11th (6.1%)</p>	Biennial

The percentage of students that have used cigarettes at school in the last 30 days. • California Student Survey (CSS) California Student Survey (CSS)	Biennial	12th Biennial (2007-08) CSS	200910: 7th (-0.5%) 9th (-0.5%) 11th (-0.5%)				
---	----------	-----------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

Comments: In 2007-08, the survey response options expanded from five to six categories, which may have affected the results.
NOTE: A request was made to EDEN, on 2/11/09, to revise the baseline because fo the change in the question. No response received to date.

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions

The following questions collect data on the out-of-school suspension and expulsion of students by grade level (e.g., K through 5, 6 through 8, 9 through 12) and type of incident (e.g., violence, weapons possession, alcohol-related, illicit drug-related).

2.7.2.1 State Definitions

In the spaces below, provide the State definitions for each type of incident.

Incident Type	State Definition
Alcohol related	California's suspension and expulsion laws authorize alcohol disciplinary actions in sections of the Education Code (EC) that also relate to illicit drug discipline so separate alcohol-related statistics are not available. The State definition of alcohol-related incidents is as follows: Alcohol-related actions for use, possession, sale, or furnishing of alcohol. Includes violations of EC sections 48900(c) possession or sale of controlled substances, alcohol, or intoxicants; 48900(d) sale of controlled substances, alcohol, or intoxicants; 48900(j) possession or sale of drug paraphernalia; 48900(p) offering or sale of prescription drugs; 48915(a)(3) unlawful possession of controlled substances, and 48915(c)(3) unlawfully selling a controlled substance.
Illicit drug related	Controlled substances listed in Chapter 2 of Division 10 of the California Health and Safety Code. NOTE: CDE does not differentiate between alcohol and other drugs. To prevent over-reporting, all data is included in 2.7.2.5.
Violent incident without physical injury	Includes California EC sections: 48900(a)(2) related to force or violence; 49000(e) committed or attempted to commit robbery or extortion; 48900(n) related to sexual assault; 48900(o) related to intimidation of a witness; 48900.3 related to hate violence; 48900.4 related to harassment, threats, or intimidation; 48900.7 related to terrorist threats; 48915(a)(4) robbery or extortion; 48915(a)(5) assault or battery; and 48915(c)(4) related to committing a sexual assault.
Violent incident with physical injury	Includes California EC sections: 48900(a)(1) related to physical injury to another person; 48915(a)(1) causing serious physical injury to another person, except in self defense; 48900(s) related to aiding or abetting the infliction or attempted infliction of physical injury.
Weapons possession	A weapon is a knife, firearm, or other dangerous object. Included are suspension and expulsions for violation of EC sections 48900(b) firearms, knives, explosive devices, etc.; 48900(m) possessed imitation firearm; 48915(a)(2) possession of knife or other dangerous object; 48915(c)(1) possession, selling, or otherwise furnishing a firearm; 48900(c)(2) brandishing a knife; and 48915(c)(5) possession of an explosive.
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.2 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

The following questions collect data on violent incident without physical injury.

2.7.2.2.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for violent incident without physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident without physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	16,011	885
6 through 8	22,681	593
9 through 12	17,306	574
Comments: The State collection for suspensions does not concur with the federal grade levels listed above. The State definitions are as follows: Elementary school is K through Grade 6, occasionally K through Grade 8. Middle school is Grades 6 through 8, occasionally Grades 7 through 8 or Grades 7 through 9. High school is Grades 9 through 12, occasionally Grades 10 through 12.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.2.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of school expulsions for violent incident without physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident without physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident Without Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	283	885
6 through 8	890	593
9 through 12	2,097	574
Comments: The State collection for expulsions does not concur with the federal grade levels listed above. The State definitions are as follows: Elementary school is K through Grade 6, occasionally K through Grade 8. Middle school is Grades 6 through 8, occasionally Grades 7 through 8 or Grades 7 through 9. High school is Grades 9 through 12, occasionally Grades 10 through 12.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.3 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

The following questions collect data on violent incident with physical injury.

2.7.2.3.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for violent incident with physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident with physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	62,513	885
6 through 8	69,018	593
9 through 12	55,959	574
Comments: The State collection for suspensions does not concur with the federal grade levels listed above. The State definitions are as follows: Elementary school is K through Grade 6, occasionally K through Grade 8. Middle school is Grades 6 through 8, occasionally Grades 7 through 8 or Grades 7 through 9. High school is Grades 9 through 12, occasionally Grades 10 through 12.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.3.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury

In the table below, provide the number of out-of school expulsions for violent incident with physical injury by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on violent incident with physical injury, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsions for Violent Incident with Physical Injury	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	327	885
6 through 8	1,394	593
9 through 12	2,636	574
Comments: The State collection for expulsions does not concur with the federal grade levels listed above. The State definitions are as follows: Elementary school is K through Grade 6, occasionally K through Grade 8. Middle school is Grades 6 through 8, occasionally Grades 7 through 8 or Grades 7 through 9. High school is Grades 9 through 12, occasionally Grades 10 through 12.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.4 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Weapons Possession

The following sections collect data on weapons possession.

2.7.2.4.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Weapons Possession

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for weapons possession by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on weapons possession, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	7,505	885
6 through 8	7,535	593
9 through 12	6,499	574
Comments: The State collection for suspensions does not concur with the federal grade levels listed above. The State definitions are as follows: Elementary school is K through Grade 6, occasionally K through Grade 8. Middle school is Grades 6 through 8, occasionally Grades 7 through 8 or Grades 7 through 9. High school is Grades 9 through 12, occasionally Grades 10 through 12.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.4.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Weapons Possession

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for weapons possession by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on weapons possession, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Weapons Possession	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	619	885
6 through 8	1,381	593
9 through 12	1,981	574
Comments: The State collection for expulsions does not concur with the federal grade levels listed above. The State definitions are as follows: Elementary school is K through Grade 6, occasionally K through Grade 8. Middle school is Grades 6 through 8, occasionally Grades 7 through 8 or Grades 7 through 9. High school is Grades 9 through 12, occasionally Grades 10 through 12.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.5 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

The following questions collect data on alcohol-related incidents.

2.7.2.5.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for alcohol-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on alcohol-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	1,133	885
6 through 8	7,703	593
9 through 12	27,849	574
Comments: 1. The State collection for suspensions does not concur with the federal grade levels listed above. The State definitions are as follows: Elementary school is K through Grade 6, occasionally K through Grade 8. Middle school is Grades 6 through 8, occasionally Grades 7 through 8 or Grades 7 through 9. High school is Grades 9 through 12, occasionally Grades 10 through 12. 2. In prior years Education Code (EC) 48900(h) -tobacco; EC 48900(j) -drug paraphenalia; and EC 48900(p) -prescription drugs, were included in the number of suspensions. This year the three ECs have been removed because they do not relate specifically to alcohol-related incidents. 3. California's suspension laws authorize alcohol disciplinary actions in sections of the EC that also relate to illicit drug discipline so separate alcohol-related statistics are not available.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.5.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Alcohol-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for alcohol-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on alcohol-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Alcohol-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	112	885
6 through 8	1,091	593
9 through 12	3,681	574
Comments: 1. The State collection for expulsions does not concur with the federal grade levels listed above. The State definitions are as follows: Elementary school is K through Grade 6, occasionally K through Grade 8. Middle school is Grades 6 through 8, occasionally Grades 7 through 8 or Grades 7 through 9. High school is Grades 9 through 12, occasionally Grades 10 through 12. 2. In prior years Education Code (EC) 48900(h) -tobacco; EC 48900(j) -drug paraphenalia; and EC 48900(p) -prescription drugs, were included in the number of suspensions. This year the three ECs have been removed because they do not relate specifically to alcohol-related incidents. 3. California's expulsion laws authorize alcohol disciplinary actions in sections of the EC that also relate to illicit drug discipline so separate alcohol-related statistics are not available.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.6 Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

The following questions collect data on illicit drug-related incidents.

2.7.2.6.1 Out-of-School Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school suspensions for illicit drug-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on illicit drug-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Suspensions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	1,133	885
6 through 8	7,703	593
9 through 12	27,849	574
Comments: 1. California's suspension laws authorize alcohol disciplinary actions in sections of the Education Code, which also relate to illicit drug discipline, so separate alcohol-related statistics are not available. The figures above are for suspensions related to alcohol and illicit drugs. 2. The State collection for suspensions does not concur with the federal grade levels listed above. The State definitions are as follows: Elementary school is K through Grade 6, occasionally K through Grade 8. Middle school is Grades 6 through 8, occasionally Grades 7 through 8 or Grades 7 through 9. High school is Grades 9 through 12, occasionally Grades 10 through 12.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.2.6.2 Out-of-School Expulsions for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents

In the table below, provide the number of out-of-school expulsions for illicit drug-related incidents by grade level. Also, provide the number of LEAs that reported data on illicit drug-related incidents, including LEAs that report no incidents.

Grades	# Expulsion for Illicit Drug-Related Incidents	# LEAs Reporting
K through 5	112	885
6 through 8	1,091	593
9 through 12	3,681	574
Comments: 1. California's expulsion laws authorize alcohol disciplinary actions in sections of the Education Code, which also relate to illicit drug discipline, so separate alcohol-related statistics are not available. The figures above are for suspensions related to alcohol and illicit drugs. 2. The State collection for expulsions does not concur with the federal grade levels listed above. The State definitions are as follows: Elementary school is K through Grade 6, occasionally K through Grade 8. Middle school is Grades 6 through 8, occasionally Grades 7 through 8 or Grades 7 through 9. High school is Grades 9 through 12, occasionally Grades 10 through 12.		

Source – Manual entry by the SEA into the online collection tool.

2.7.3 Parent Involvement

In the table below, provide the types of efforts your State uses to inform parents of, and include parents in, drug and violence prevention efforts. Place a check mark next to the five most common efforts underway in your State. If there are other efforts underway in your State not captured on the list, add those in the other specify section.

Yes/No	Parental Involvement Activities
Yes	Information dissemination on Web sites and in publications, including newsletters, guides, brochures, and "report cards" on school performance
Yes	Training and technical assistance to LEAs on recruiting and involving parents
Yes	State requirement that parents must be included on LEA advisory councils
Yes	State and local parent training, meetings, conferences, and workshops
No	Parent involvement in State-level advisory groups
Yes	Parent involvement in school-based teams or community coalitions
Yes	Parent surveys, focus groups, and/or other assessments of parent needs and program effectiveness
Yes	Media and other campaigns (Public service announcements, red ribbon campaigns, kick-off events, parenting awareness month, safe schools week, family day, etc.) to raise parental awareness of drug and alcohol or safety issues
No	Other Specify 1
No	Other Specify 2

In the space below, specify 'other' parental activities. The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.8 INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS (TITLE V, PART A)

This section collects information pursuant to Title V, Part A of ESEA.

2.8.1 Annual Statewide Summary

Section 5122 of ESEA, requires States to provide an annual Statewide summary of how Title V, Part A funds contribute to the improvement of student academic performance and the quality of education for students. In addition, these summaries must be based on evaluations provided to the State by LEAs receiving program funds.

Please attach your statewide summary. You can upload file by entering the file name and location in the box below or use the browse button to search for the file as you would when attaching a file to an e-mail. The maximum file size for this upload is 4 meg.

2.8.2 Needs Assessments

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that completed a Title V, Part A needs assessment that the State determined to be credible and the total number of LEAs that received Title V, Part A funds. The percentage column is automatically calculated.

	# LEAs	%
Completed credible Title V, Part A needs assessments	1,190	100.0
Total received Title V, Part A funds	1,190	
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.8.3 LEA Expenditures

In the table below, provide the amount of Title V, Part A funds expended by the LEAs. The percentage column will be automatically calculated.

The 4 strategic priorities are: (1) support student achievement, enhance reading and mathematics, (2) improve the quality of teachers, (3) ensure that schools are safe and drug free, and (4) promote access for all students to a quality education.

Activities authorized under Section 5131 of the ESEA that are included in the four strategic priorities are 1-5, 7-9, 12, 14-17, 1920, 22, and 25-27. Authorized activities that are not included in the four strategic priorities are 6, 10-11, 13, 18, 21, and 23-24.

	\$ Amount	%
Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs for the four strategic priorities	11,032,680	95.5
Total Title V, Part A funds expended by LEAs	11,547,300	
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.8.4 LEA Uses of Funds for the Four Strategic Priorities and AYP

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs:

1. That used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities above and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of adequate yearly progress (AYP).
2. That did not use at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of AYP.
3. For which you do not know whether they used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities and the number of these LEAs that met their State's definition of AYP.

The total LEAs receiving Title V, Part A funds will be automatically calculated.

	# LEAs	# LEAs Met AYP
Used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	1,089	599
Did not use at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	101	55
Not known whether they used at least 85 percent of their Title V, Part A funds for the four strategic priorities	0	0
Total LEAs receiving Title V, Part A funds	1,190	654
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.9 RURAL EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT PROGRAM (REAP) (TITLE VI, PART B, SUBPARTS 1 AND 2)

This section collects data on the Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP) Title VI, Part B, Subparts 1 and 2.

2.9.1 LEA Use of Alternative Funding Authority Under the Small Rural Achievement (SRSA) Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 1)

In the table below, provide the number of LEAs that notified the State of their intent to use the alternative uses funding authority under Section 6211.

	# LEAs
# LEA's using SRSA alternative uses of funding authority	279
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.9.2 LEA Use of Rural Low-Income Schools Program (RLIS) (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2) Grant Funds

In the table below, provide the number of eligible LEAs that used RLIS funds for each of the listed purposes.

Purpose	# LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	2
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	16
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	10
Parental involvement activities	4
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	2
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	19
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	9
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.9.2.1 Goals and Objectives

In the space below, describe the progress the State has made in meeting the goals and objectives for the Rural Low-Income Schools (RLIS) Program as described in its June 2002 Consolidated State application. Provide quantitative data where available.

The response is limited to 8,000 characters.

For the 2007-08 school year, the State Education Agency (SEA) participated in the Rural Low-Income School (RLIS) Program by awarding subgrants to 29 local educational agencies (LEAs) using a formula allocation driven by each district's average daily attendance (ADA). The CDE informs the recipient LEAs about the specific state criteria and annual targets to increase the academic performance and achievement of all students. California's accountability system monitors progress toward ensuring that all students are achieving the state's academic content standards and meeting those targets. The measure of such student achievement is the determination of whether Title I schools and LEAs make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), as required under NCLB. Following are the four components used to make AYP determinations in California:

- * Meeting Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) regarding student proficiency in English-language arts and mathematics
- * Achieving a 95 percent student participation rate on assessments in English-language arts and mathematics
- * Making or exceeding the specified growth target on the state's Academic Performance Index (API)
- * Increasing the high school graduation rate

In reviewing data of the 29 LEAs that received a FY 2007-08 RLIS grant, seven were in Program Improvement (PI) status. One LEA was newly identified at the beginning of the 2007-08 school year; one LEA was continuing in Year 1 of PI; one LEA was continuing in Year 2 of PI; two LEAs had moved into Year 2 of PI; and two LEAs moved into Year 3 of PI status.

When identified for PI, LEAs in California are required to 1) conduct a self-assessment using materials and criteria based on current research; 2) use specific state-developed self-assessment tools to verify the fundamental teaching and learning needs in its schools and identify the specific academic problems of low-achieving students; 3) determine why the prior LEA plan failed to bring about increased student achievement; 4) revise the LEA plan according to the identified needs; and 5) work with an external entity to ensure that the district is using funds appropriately to improve student achievement.

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.10 FUNDING TRANSFERABILITY FOR STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES (TITLE VI, PART A, SUBPART 2)

2.10.1 State Transferability of Funds

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of Section 6123(a) during SY 2007-08?	No
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.10.2 Local Educational Agency (LEA) Transferability of Funds

	#
LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of Section 6123(b).	261
Comments:	

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

2.10.2.1 LEA Funds Transfers

In the tables below, provide the total number of LEAs that transferred funds from and to each eligible program and the total amount of funds transferred from and to each eligible program.

Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds FROM Eligible Program	# LEAs Transferring Funds TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	137	12
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	5	28
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	65	5
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	38	65
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		81

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred FROM Eligible Program	Total Amount of Funds Transferred TO Eligible Program
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Section 2121)	8,634,905.00	61,341.00
Educational Technology State Grants (Section 2412(a)(2)(A))	8,405.00	830,803.00
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (Section 4112(b)(1))	610,355.00	81,571.00
State Grants for Innovative Programs (Section 5112(a))	43,605.00	6,930,697.00
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs		1,392,858.00
Comments:		

Source – Manual entry by SEA into the online collection tool.

The Department plans to obtain information on the use of funds under both the State and LEA Transferability Authority through evaluation studies.